

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 97/32005 hereinafter WO '005. Applicants respectfully submit that WO '005 does not present *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As correctly stated by the Examiner, WO '005 does not disclose:

- an anionic surfactant particle for use in a laundry detergent composition the particle having a total anionic surfactant content of at least 95wt%;
- LAS/PAS ratio of from 5:1 to 1:3.

According to applicants' invention, a particle of LAS and PAS containing little or no inorganic salt can be prepared which combines low hygroscopicity with an excellent detergency profile. Therefore the objective technical problem solved by the present invention is how to produce a particle that has low hygroscopicity and an excellent detergency profile. This problem is solved by the formation of a composite particle having a total anionic surfactant content of at least 95wt% and a LAS/PAS ratio of from 5:1 to 1:3.

WO '005 seeks to solve a problem of providing an effective degree of detergency in a laundry composition. WO '005 teaches that there is a maximum level of active that can be incorporated to achieve this, see page 1 lines 18-19, and lines 29 to 31, line 34 to page 2 line 6, and that these problems of an inadequate maximum can be overcome through the incorporation of at least 15% by weight of phosphate builder, and aluminosilicate builder. It teaches that the zeolite component is essential to achieve good powder properties, see the control example page 18. One of ordinary skill in the art seeking to improve the detergency would have been led by WO '005 to add phosphate and aluminosilicate and would not therefore have been motivated to work within the ranges and at the levels disclosed in the present invention. Especially as an essential component of the invention in WO '005 is the

requirement of at least 15wt% of phosphate to achieve the required results, this would not leave formulation space for the incorporation of the levels of surfactant in the presently claimed invention.

Motivation to modify must come from the prior art. It is not seen what in WO '005 would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to change the total anionic surfactant content and to employ a particular range of the ratio of LAS/PAS. On the contrary, as discussed above, WO '005 provides a disincentive for such changes.

Claims 1-11 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over the claims of co-pending Application No. 10/726,739. With respect to the double-patenting rejection, in light of the availability of Terminal Disclaimer practice, applicants agree to the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer upon an indication of the allowable subject matter.

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be allowed to issue.

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of the present application, applicants' undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rimma Mitelman  
Registration No. 34,396  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

RM/sa  
(201) 894-2671